

Leop. Thor. Pitts

PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE.

THE QUESTION STATED AND CONSIDERED.

BY HORACE GREELEY

I. The Points of Agreement.

I SHALL hardly be disputed when I assert that the great mass of the American People are agreed in the conviction that it is easier, more beneficent, less burdensome, more economical, to raise the Revenue needed for the support of the Federal Government by *Duties on Imports* than by *Direct Taxes*. In saying this, I am quite aware that the doctrines propounded by Free Traders do indeed, if carried out to their legitimate consequences, imply that *all Duties on Imports* are wrong, and that the Federal Revenue should be raised by Direct Taxation. No one can read a speech of Calhoun, McDuffie, Woodbury, or even Silas Wright, and not perceive that its assumptions, if accepted for truth, do irresistibly point to the conclusion that all Custom-Houses and Duties should be abolished, so that Sugar shall be received at New-York and Boston on precisely the same footing from Havana as from New Orleans, and Cloths poured into our ports and our interior as freely from Old as from New-England. An impartial listener to one of these powerful debaters, after hearing him depict, in all the colors of a heated fancy, the oppressive burthens imposed on the Farming and Planting Interests by the present Tariff, for the exclusive benefit of Manufacturers, must surely expect that he will close by demanding the entire repeal of the Tariff and the substitution of some radically different, more equal and just, mode of taxation. But, when the speaker, after positively asserting, and after his fashion demonstrating, that a duty of forty per cent. on Woollen Cloths, for instance, does actually enhance by forty per cent. the cost to our consumers not only of the Cloths they import, but of those produced in this Country—tapers off into a demand that this duty shall be reduced from forty to thirty or even twenty-five per cent. the hearer will be impelled to exclaim—'Most lame and impotent conclusion!'—For, if there be any soundness in the premises of the speaker, *his Tariff* will still compel the purchasers of Woollen Goods in this country to pay a bounty of some

Thirty Millions to the manufacturers of those fabrics in order to secure a payment of some Three Millions into the Treasury! And this is not the worst—this sum is not merely taken from the great mass of our People and given to a small class, but it is in good part a dead loss to the Country and to the world, since the fact that Foreign Cloths continue to be imported under this duty demonstrates (according to Free Trade logic) that we ought not to make Cloths at all, but could more profitably employ our industry in some other calling, and thereby add immensely to the value of our annual product. Nothing, therefore, can be plainer than this, that the Free Trade premises are irreconcilably opposed to the conclusions at which the oracles of that school arrive, or in which they surely acquiesce. Accordingly, a few sincere, ardent, straight-forward disciples of that school repudiate entirely the conclusions of their temporizing legislators, and openly, consistently unfurl the banner of 'Free Trade and Direct Taxation!' But these have not yet secured the open adherence of any considerable or influential portion of their own party, and, wherever their doctrines are assailed by Protectionists, the accredited organs of the anti-Protection party at once disclaim the responsibility of any such sentiments, and declare that *they* are in favor of a *Revenue Tariff*. Practically, therefore, the American People are for the present agreed on this point, that the Revenue required by the Federal Government shall mainly, if not wholly, be raised by Duties on Foreign Products imported into our Country.

II. The Grounds of Difference.

But when we come to discuss and determine the mode in which Duties shall be imposed for this purpose, a radical disagreement is manifested. Indeed, the Free Traders, while agreeing that Duties shall be imposed for Revenue only, differ widely among themselves as to the mode of imposing such Duties, or the proper definition and construction of a purely Revenue Tariff. The most natural and obvious definition

PROTECTION AND FREE TRADE—The Question Stated and Considered—By H. Greeley, is published by Greeley & McElrath, at 160 NASSAULT, New-York. Price \$2 per hundred, \$15 per thousand.

THE TARIFF AS IT IS, Compared with the substitute proposed by its Adversaries—By H. GREELEY—in a tract of similar size and shape to this, is published at the same place and price. * * * Orders from Clay Clubs and Whigs generally are respectfully solicited.

would seem to point to the ~~lowest~~ ^{lowest} rate of Duties which ~~could produce~~ ^{could produce} the amount required. This is a genuine Horizontal Tariff. But the *Washington Globe*, the National organ of the party, sets up another rule, which has great plausibility. It insists that a uniform rate would not form a proper Revenue Tariff, because many articles would produce more Revenue if taxed below the average rate of Duty. For example, suppose the average rate is twenty per cent. But it appears that a duty of twenty per cent. will check the importation of certain articles which are produced or rivaled at home—for instance, Hats, Boots and Shoes, Cotton fabrics, Agricultural staples, &c. are produced here so cheaply that a duty of twenty per cent. would almost forbid their importation; but if a lower duty be imposed—fifteen, ten, or five per cent.—they would flow in and produce more Revenue than at a higher rate. Now this, says the *Globe*, is the true mode of procuring a Revenue Tariff—Put your highest duties on such articles as we import exclusively—Tea, Coffee, Spices, Drugs and Dyes, Furs, Mahogany, &c.—and a much lower duty on such articles as we produce or fabricate at home. This is unquestionably the mode, if we assume Protection to be an evil, and Free Trade a blessing. On the other hand, there are many protected advocates of Free Trade who propose discriminations by duties above the average rate on certain articles fabricated abroad. But all such are Free Trade men only in name; they may decry Protection, but they have admitted and justified the principle of Protection, and the controversy between them and avowed Protectionists can really extend only to detail and degree. For, manifestly, the imposition of a higher duty on any article does tend to diminish the importation of that article; so that a duty of fifty per cent. on Hats or Boots would probably produce less Revenue than one of twenty per cent. There is, indeed, a remoter influence of a wisely discriminated Tariff, whereby the Productive Industry of the Country being cherished and stimulated, its Wealth is increased, and thus its willingness to purchase with its ability to pay for the products of other climates and regions. It is quite possible that the Imports of this or any other Country, after ten years of enlightened Protection, might be greater than after ten years of a Horizontal Revenue Tariff, because of the greater capacity of the Country to purchase in the former case. Thus we see that Great Britain, after centuries of high duties—many of them apparently unwise and injurious—at which other Nations habitually grumble, does yet purchase more of Foreign products every year than does any other Nation on the globe. But this is not a result which enters into the calculations of Free Trade.

The fundamental, irreconcilable difference between Protection and Free Trade, then, is this—Free Trade insists that, in laying Imposts for the support of the Government, regard should be had to the amount of Revenue only, and that lower, or at least no higher, Duties should be levied on those articles which come in competition with the products of our Home Industry than on others; while Protection maintains the contrary, as it demands that, by a wise and careful discrimination, every possible encouragement and aid

be given to the Industry of the Country, by subsidizing the branches or departments of Productive Labor already in existence among us, and by calling into existence others to which, it is clearly demonstrable, the climate, soil, and other circumstances of our Country urgently invite us.

III. Familiar Illustrations.

Under former Tariffs, the duties on Furs of all descriptions were equal; and, in consequence, much or most of the Furs used in this Country were prepared or 'dressed' in England. But the Tariff of 1842 (Sec. 5, clause 8) prescribed that Furs imported on the skin should be charged five per cent while all Furs dressed or cut from the skin should be charged twenty-five per cent.—This discrimination has created or greatly extended a new branch of business in this Country, has given profitable employment to a considerable body of workmen, and saved a handsome sum annually to the Country. Will any man contend that Hats are dearer in consequence? or that any other ill effect has been realized?

Now let us suppose our average Annual Imports are One Hundred Millions of Dollars, and that we need, for the proper support and maintenance of the Government Twenty-two Millions of Dollars per annum, and to pay off Debts, &c. Three Millions—together, Twenty-five Millions. Of course, if we raise this by a Horizontal Tariff, we must tax all Imports uniformly twenty-five per cent. on their acquisition. If we discriminate partly for Revenue, we must tax Tea and Coffee, Furs, Ivory, Mahogany, and all such articles as we cannot produce here, thirty to thirty-five per cent. while on Cloths, Wool, Boots and Shoes, Hardware, Ready-made Clothing, &c. we should charge but five to fifteen per cent. lowering the duty to any point required to bring the Foreign article into full and formidable competition with the domestic, and so ensure a large importation. This would be a strictly Revenue Tariff. But a Protective Tariff is adjusted on precisely opposite principles—inposing duties of thirty to forty per cent. on such articles as compete most formidably with our own products—such as we could very well produce here if we did not import them—and lower duties or none on Tea, Coffee, Furs, and all other articles which Nature has denied us the means of advantageously producing—all those which, though forming the bases of manufacture here, must themselves be imported from abroad. Where an article is both produced at home and imported, in several different stages, a low duty would be imposed on the raw material, higher on the ruder product therefrom, and a higher still on the finished fabric. Thus the present Tariff taxes Hides, Leather, Boots and Shoes, rising at every succeeding stage. This is Protection, and such is the difference between a purely Revenue and a Protective Tariff.

IV. Protection Abstractly Considered.

Protection is the fundamental necessity, the primary object, of all rightful Government. To protect each other against the felonious practices of the swindler, the burglar, the assassin, or the more formidable assaults of barbarian hordes, of ambitious chieftains, of invading armies, the members of a community unite to bear the burdens and submit to the restrictions of natural

ANTI-SLAVERY
337
T 174
vol 1
cop. 2

right incidental to the existence of Government. Each individual, on his part, incurs the obligations, submits to the restrictions, and assumes the burthens of citizenship, on the implied but palpable contract of the Government to protect him in the full enjoyment of those rights reserved to him under the social compact; in the undisturbed and absolute use of the products of his own labor and skill, and in the right to employ advantageously all his faculties in the acquirement of an adequate subsistence.

Very few have ever denied to Government the right and duty of protecting its people from overt acts of aggression and violence. That an invading foe should be resisted, a law-breaking villain arrested and confined, or a domineering, encroaching Nation checked and resisted, are propositions so plain that no writer of note on Government has doubted or demurred to them.

Now it cannot be seriously, considerably denied, that a Nation may be injured as certainly and vitally by the policy of a rival as by its arms. An Order in Council, an act of legislation, may cripple the Commerce and blight the Industry of a distant Nation, when open hostility would have been wholly unavailing. The Navigation Act of Great Britain did more to destroy the commercial importance of Holland than all the fleets that ever issued from Portsmouth and Plymouth.—History is full of examples of the decline and destruction of Nations from causes which they failed clearly to recognize, but which later and clear-sighted observers have readily detected in the grasping policy and deep-laid plans of a subtle and determined rival.

It would seem, therefore, self-evident that it is as clearly and fully the duty of a Government to guard its citizens against the insidious influences of hostile foreign policy, as against the more direct and manly assaults of foreign armies. I would seem that a wise and paternal Government should as carefully guard, as unsleepingly watch, against the machinations of Foreign Cabinets as the snook of hostile fleets and battalions.

V. Protection Needed—Reciprocity.

To illustrate the above position, let us adduce a case such as has substantially happened at least once in the history of our own Country. Let us suppose that the great mass of our People are satisfactorily engaged in Agricultural pursuits, and that they obtain their manufactured Goods by an exchange of their surplus Wheat for the fabrics and wares of Great Britain. No duty, or a very moderate one, for Revenue merely, is charged on either side. At length, however, Great Britain resolves to produce her own grain, and to this end imposes a heavy, a prohibitory duty, on its importation from abroad. By this act our Farmers are left without a market for their surplus, its price depreciates, and it remains a drag on their hands. British fabrics are still pouring into our ports, are sold for fewer dollars than it would cost to produce them here, and thus fill all the channels of trade. What is the duty thereby imposed on our Government? Free Trade affirms that it should do nothing, but simply wait until the inevitable bankruptcy of our business classes, the continued decline in price of our great staples, the withdrawal of our specie and the degradation or destruction of our circulating medium, shall have

reduced the price of American Labor, and with it all sorts of Labor, so low that the Manufactures we need can be produced here at as low a money price as in England. This is what is implied by leaving trade to 'regulate itself.' But Protection insists that this is neither a wise nor a stable adjustment of the difficulty. It is not wise, for it involves our People in an infinity of suffering, stagnation and pecuniary loss; it is not stable, for the first gleam of prosperity in our land—if such gleam could be under that policy—would draw hither cargo after cargo of British Goods, and ensure a repetition of our disasters. Now the true and in itself policy of our Government, as it appears most obvious to us, is to meet the aggressive policy of our rival at once—to countervail duty by duty, restriction by restriction—to protect and foster our Manufactures as fast and far as Britain at our expense shall favor her Agriculture—and thus to preserve our People from the bottomless abyss of foreign debt and bankruptcy, extend their sphere of industry, and lay deep and enduring the bases of a substantial National Independence of all foreign policy whatever.

Let us take another illustration: Great Britain, about two hundred years ago, passed her Navigation Act allowing Goods to be imported into her ports in British vessels at a lower rate of duty than the same goods must pay if imported in foreign vessels. This simple act of aggressive fostering her own Commerce is the foundation of her long career of overwhelming Commercial and Maritime ascendancy—an ascendancy which would never have existed to any such extent if the other Nations of Europe had at once perceived the absolute necessity of countervailing this advantage. They did not, however; and the consequence is seen in the decline of their Commerce and Marine to the verge of extinction, and in the elevation of their once humble rival to the proud station of Mistress of the Seas. Under the blighting effect of this grasping policy our own Commerce languished during the whole term of our peaceful existence as a Confederation.

But when the terms of a 'more perfect union' had been agreed on, and a Congress assembled clothed with power to watch over and protect the interests of our People, we find that one of its first acts was aimed at the express Protection and encouragement of Manufactures on our own soil, by a duty on the importation of foreign Goods, and the next was intended to countervail the Navigation Act of Great Britain, by enacting that a corresponding discrimination should be made between the import hither of dutiable articles in foreign and in American vessels—to be waived in behalf of the ships of all Nations which did not discriminate against our own. This immediately brought Britain to terms. She consented to admit American vessels to her ports on the same terms with her own, upon our doing the same, and this arrangement remains still in effect. But for this timely and efficient countervailing of the British Navigation Act, American Commerce in our own vessels would be as that of Holland now is—as that of Venice has long been. Protection has secured to us a genuine Freedom and Reciprocity, where one-sided Free Trade would have soon stripped us of any Commerce at all.

For many years no man has dreamed of or asked for the repeal of our countervailing or protective Navigation Act, while thousands fiercely clamor against all other Protective legislation! On what principle is this distinction made? Are our Free Trade importers and ship-owners unwilling to submit their own business to the policy they would impose on the Internal Industry of the Country? Do they cling to Protection for their own interests, yet deny it to those of all other classes? These are questions which should no longer remain unanswered.

VI. Protection broadly considered—G. Britain.

But the principle of Protection is impreguably entrenched in other considerations than that of defence against positive foreign aggression. We maintain that there is obvious policy, wise economy, and true, far-seeing statesmanship in that view of Protection which regards it in itself, and without respect to the course of other Nations, as a means of fostering into healthful vigor new branches of industry and increasing the general product of the Country. We disclaim all aggressive Protection—all legislation or policy whose aim shall be to enable American producers to undersell those of other Nations abroad. We demand simply that the toiling masses of our own goodly land may be enabled to sit in peace beneath their own vine and fig-tree secure in their several employments, and finding a just reward and stimulus for their industry in ministering to each other's wants and enjoyments to mutual advantage. We seek to build up no policy like that of Great Britain, to make our own Country the Rialto of Nations, the maker, and refiner, and trafficker and carrier for all other Countries. We do not want other Nations constrained by policy or craft to bring their bread to be baked in our ovens, any more than to carry our loaves to theirs. We ask no policy like Britain's, which shall bring hither the gold and gems of all climes and kindreds, and pile them up on our shores. It is because we are utterly hostile to that grasping selfishness which seeks to secure and perpetuate in its own hands a monopoly of the Trade and Manufactures of the World, that we combine to resist it, and counsel our countrymen to see that it be steadily counteracted, so far as it affects ourselves. Those, therefore, who argue against defensive Protection from the effects of British policy in the depression of British Labor, wholly mistake the nature and essence of the controversy. That depression is a part of our case—it is an impressive, urgent reason why the Colossus of British monopoly should be attacked and overthrown, as injurious to the great Laboring mass even of Britons as well as others. It is for this reason that, while the restrictive policy of England is felt as an intolerable burthen by her own working people, the countervailing acts of Germany and the other Nations of Continental Europe are recognized by their People as essential to their individual welfare no less than to National Independence and Prosperity.

We cannot, therefore, but regard the assertion that proper Protective Duties will not promote the interests of the Laboring Classes here because what are called Protective Duties have an unfavorable effect in England, as addressed to the ig-

norance rather than the understanding of those whom it is employed to influence. There is nothing like analogy in the cases—the seeming resemblance is one of sound, not of sense. Those who employ it are careful to keep it as far from the light as possible.

VII. The Light of History.

Cast your eyes where you will over the face of the Earth—trace back the History of Man and of Nations to the earliest recorded periods, and you will find this rule uniformly prevailing, that the Nation which is eminently an Agricultural and Grain exporting Nation—which depends mainly or principally on other Nations for its regular supplies of Manufactured fabrics has been comparatively a poor Nation, and ultimately a dependent Nation. I do not say that this is the instant result of exchanging the rude staples of Agriculture for the more delicate fabrics of Art, but I maintain that it is the inevitable tendency. The Agricultural Nation falls in debt, becomes impoverished and ultimately subject. The palaces of 'merchant princes' may emblazon its harbors and overshadow its navigable waters; there may be a mighty Alexandria, but a miserable Egypt behind it; a flourishing Odessa or Dantzic, but a rude, thinly-peopled Southern Russia or Poland; the exchangers may flourish and roll in luxury, but the producers famish and die. Indeed, few old and civilized countries become largely exporters of Grain until they have lost, or by corruption are prepared to surrender, their Independence: and these often present the spectacle of the Laborer starving on the fields he has tilled in the midst of their fertility and promise.—These appearances rest upon and indicate a law, which I shall endeavor hereafter to explain.

VIII. Agriculture and Manufactures in a New Country.

There is a natural tendency in a comparatively new Country to become and continue an Exporter of Grain and other rude staples, and an Importer of Manufactures.

I think I hardly need waste time in demonstrating this proposition, since it is illustrated and confirmed by universal experience, and rests on obvious laws. The new Country has abundant and fertile soil, and produces Grain with remarkable facility; also Meats, Timber, Ashes, and most rude and bulky articles. Labor is there in demand, being required to clear, to build, to open roads, &c. and the Laborers are comparatively few: while in older Countries Labor is abundant and cheap, as well as Capital, Machinery, and all the means of the cheap production of Manufactured fabrics. I surely need not waste words to show that, in the absence of any counteracting policy, the new Country will import, and continue to import, largely of the fabrics of older Countries, and to pay for them, so far as she may, with her Agricultural staples. I will endeavor to show hereafter that she will continue to do this long after she has attained a condition to manufacture them as cheaply for herself, even regarding the money cost alone. But that does not come under the present head. The whole history of our Country, and especially from 1782 to '90, when we had no Tariff and scarcely any Paper Money—proves that, whatever may be the

Currency or the internal condition of the new Country, it will continue to draw its chief supplies from the Old—large or small, according to its measure of ability to pay or obtain credit for them—but still, putting Duties on Imports out of the question, it will continue to buy its Manufactures abroad, whether in prosperity or adversity, inflation or depression.

IX. *This Partial Direction of Industry is Per- nicious.*

As this is probably the point on which the doctrines of Protection come most directly in collision with those of Free Trade, I will treat it more deliberately, and endeavor to illustrate and demonstrate it.

I presume I need not waste time in proving that the ruling price of Agricultural products (as also of Manufactures) in a region whence either are considerably exported, will be *their price at the point to which they are exported, less the cost of such transportation*. For instance: the cost of transporting Grain hither from large grain-growing sections of Illinois was last Fall fifty cents; and, New-York being their most available market, and the price here one dollar, the market there at once settled at fifty cents.—As this adjustment of prices rests on a law obvious, immutable as gravitation, I presume I need not waste words in establishing it.

I proceed, then, to my next point. The average price of Wheat throughout the world is something less than one dollar per bushel; higher where the consumption largely exceeds the adjacent production—lower where the production largely exceeds the immediate consumption. (I put out of view in this statement the inequalities created by Tariffs, as I choose at this point to argue the question on the basis of universal Free Trade, which is of course the basis most favorable to my opponents.) I say, then, if all Tariffs were abolished to-morrow, the price of Wheat in England, that being the most considerable ultimate market of surpluses, and the chief supplier of our Manufactures, would govern the price in this country, while it would be itself governed by the price at which that staple could be procured in sufficiency from other grain-growing regions. Now Southern Russia and Central Poland produce Wheat for exportation at thirty to fifty cents per bushel; but the price is so increased by the cost of transportation that at Dantzic it averages some 90 and at Odessa some 80 cents per bushel. The cost of importation to England from these ports being 10 and 15 cents respectively, the actual cost of the article in England all charges paid, and allowing for a small increase of price consequent on the increased demand, would not, in the absence of all Tariffs whatever, exceed one dollar and ten cents per bushel; and this must be the average price at which we must sell it in England in order to buy thence the great bulk of our Manufactures. I think no man will dispute or seriously vary this calculation. Neither can any reflecting man seriously contend that we could purchase forty or fifty millions' worth or more of Foreign Manufactures per annum, and pay for them in additional products of our Slave Labor—in Cotton and Tobacco. The consumption of these articles is now pressed to its utmost limit—that of Cotton especially is borne down by

the immense weight of the crops annually thrown upon it, and almost constantly on the verge of a glut. If we are to buy our Manufactures principally from Europe, we must pay for the additional amount mainly in the products of Northern Agricultural industry—that is universally agreed on. The point to be determined is whether we could obtain them abroad cheaper—*really* and positively cheaper—all Tariffs being abrogated, than under an efficient system of Protection.

Let us closely scan this question. Illinois and Indiana, natural grain-growing States, need Cloths; and, in the absence of all Tariffs, these can be transported to them from England for two to three per cent. on their value. It follows, then, that, in order to undersell any American competition, the British Manufacturer need only put his cloths at his factory at *five* per cent. below the wholesale price of such cloths in Illinois in order to command the American market. That is, allowing a fair broadcloth to be manufactured in or near Illinois for three dollars and a quarter per yard, cash price, in the face of the British rivalry and paying American prices for materials and labor, the British manufacturer has only to make that same cloth at three dollars per yard in Leeds or Huddersfield, and he can decidedly undersell his American rival, and drive him out of the market. Mind I do not say that he *would* supply the Illinois market at that price *after* the American rivalry had been crushed; I know he *would not*; but so long as any serious effort to build up or sustain Manufactures in this country existed, the large and strong European establishments would struggle for the additional market which our growing and plenteous country so invitingly proffers. It is well known that in 1815-16, after the close of the Last War, British Manufactures were offered for sale in our chief markets at the rate of "*pound for pound*"—that is, the goods of which the first cost to the manufacturer was \$4 44 were offered in Boston market at \$3 33, duty paid. This was not sacrifice—it was dictated by a profound forecast. Well did the foreign fabricators know that their self-interest dictated the utter overthrow, at whatever cost, of the young rivals which the War had built up in this country, and which our Government and a majority of the People had blindly or indolently abandoned to their fate. William Cobbett, the celebrated Radical, but with a sturdy English heart, boasted upon his first return to England that he had been actively engaged here in promoting the interests of his country by compassing the destruction of American Manufactories in various ways which he specified—"sometimes (says he) *by Fire*." We all know that great sacrifices are often submitted to by a rich and long-established stage owner, steamboat proprietor, or whatever, to break down a young and comparatively penniless rival. So in a thousand instances, especially in a rivalry for so large a prize as the supplying with Manufactures of a great and growing nation. But I here put aside all calculations of temporary sacrifice; I suppose merely that the Foreign Manufacturers will supply our grain growing States with cloths at a trifling profit so long as they encounter American rivalry; and I say it is *per se* obvious that, if it cost three dollars and a quarter a yard to make a

fair broadcloth in or near Illinois, in the infancy of our arts, and a like article could be made in Europe for three dollars, then the utter destruction of the American manufacture is inevitable. The Foreign drives it out of the market and its maker into bankruptcy; and now our farmers, in purchasing their cloths, 'buy where they can buy cheapest,' which is the first commandment of Free Trade, and get their cloth of England at three dollars a yard. I maintain that this would not last a year after the American factories had been stopped—that now the British operator would begin to think of *profits* as well as bare cost for his cloth, and to adjust his prices so as to recover what it had cost him to put down the dangerous competition. But let this pass for the present, and say the Foreign cloth is sold to Illinois for three dollars per yard. We have yet to ascertain how much she has gained or lost by the operation.

This, says Free Trade, is very plain and easy. The four simple rules of Arithmetic suffice to measure it. She has bought, say a million yards of Foreign cloth for three dollars, where she formerly paid three and a quarter for American—making a clear saving of a quarter of a million of dollars.

But not so fast—we have omitted one important element of the calculation. We have yet to see what effect the purchase of her cloth in Europe, as contrasted with its manufacture at home, will have on the price of her Agricultural staples. We have seen already that, in case she is forced to sell a portion of her surplus product in Europe, the price of that surplus must be the price which can be procured for it in England *less* the cost of carrying it there. In other words: the average price in England being one dollar and ten cents, and the average cost of bringing it to New York being at least fifty cents, and then of transporting it to England at least twenty-five more, the net proceeds to Illinois must exceed thirty-five cents per bushel. I need not more than state so obvious a truth as that the price at which the surplus can be sold governs the price of the whole crop; nor indeed if it were possible to deny this would it at all affect the argument. The real question to be determined is not whether the American or the British manufacturers will furnish the most cloth for the least cash, but which will supply the requisite quantity of cloth for the least Grain in Illinois. Now we have seen already that the price of Grain at any point where it is readily and largely produced is governed by its nearness to or remoteness from the market to which its surplus tends, and the least favorable market in which any portion of it must be sold. For instance: if Illinois produces a surplus of five millions bushels of Grain, and can sell one million of bushels in New York, and two millions in New England, and another million in the West Indies, and for the fifth million is compelled to seek a market in England, and that being the remotest point at which she sells, and the point most exposed to disadvantageous competition, is naturally the poorest market, that farthest and lowest market to which she sends her surplus will govern to a great extent, if not absolutely, the price she receives for her entire surplus. But, on the other hand, let her cloths, her wares, be manufactured in her

midst, or on the junctions and water-falls in her vicinity, thus affording an immediate market for her Grain, and now the average price of it rises, by an irresistible law, nearly or quite to the average of the world. Assuming that average to be one dollar, the price in Illinois, making allowances for the fertility and cheapness of her soil, could not fall below an average of seventy-five cents. Indeed, the experience of the periods when her consumption of Grain has been equal to her production, as well as that of other sections where the same has been the case, proves conclusively that the average price of her Wheat would exceed that sum.

We are now ready to calculate the profit and loss. Illinois, under Free Trade, with her 'workshops in Europe,' will buy her cloth twenty-five cents per yard cheaper, and thus make a nominal saving of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars in her year's supply; but she thereby compels herself to pay for it in wheat at thirty-five instead of seventy-five cents per bushel, or to give very nearly *nine* bushels of wheat for every yard under Free Trade, instead of *four* and a third under a system of Home Production. In other words, while she is making a quarter of a million dollars by buying her cloth 'where she can buy cheapest,' she is losing nearly Two Millions of Dollars on the net product of her Grain. The striking of a balance between her profit and loss is certainly not a difficult, but rather an unpromising operation.

Or, let us state the result in another form:—She can buy her cloth a little cheaper in England, Labor being there lower, and Machinery more perfect, and Capital more abundant; but in order to pay for it she must not merely sell her own products at a corresponding low price, but enough lower to overcome the cost of transporting them from Illinois to England. She will give the cloth-maker in England less grain for her cloth than she would give to the man who made it in her midst; but for every bushel she sends him in payment for his fabric, she must give two to the wagoner, boatmen, shipper and factor who transports it there. On the whole product of her industry, two-thirds is tolled out by carriers and bored out by Inspectors, until but a beggarly remnant is left to satisfy the fabricator of her goods.

X. *Why Manufacturers specially need Protection.*

And here I trust I have made obvious the law which dooms an Agricultural country to inevitable and ruinous disadvantage in exchanging its staples for Manufactures, and involves it in perpetual and increasing debt and dependence. Is not the *reason* now apparent? It is not that Agricultural communities are more extravagant or less industrious than those in which Manufactures or Commerce preponderate—it is because there is an inevitable disadvantage to Agriculture in the very nature of all distant exchanges. Its products are far more perishable than any other; they cannot so well await a future demand; but in their excessive bulk and density is the great evil. We have seen that while the English manufacturer can send his fabrics to Illinois for less than five per cent. on their first cost, the Illinois farmer must pay two hundred per cent. on his Grain for its transportation to English consumers. In other words: the English manufacturer need

only produce his goods five per cent. below the American to drive the latter out of the Illinois market; the Illinoisian must produce wheat for one third of its English price in order to compete with the English and Polish grain-grower in Birmingham and Silesia.

And here is the answer to that scintillation of Free Trade wisdom which flashes out in wonder that *Manufactures* are eternally and especially in want of Protection, while Agriculture and Commerce need none. The assumption is false in any sense—our Commerce and Navigation cannot live without Protection—never did live so—but let that pass. It is the interest of the whole country which demands that that portion of its Industry which is *most exposed* to ruin—us foreign rivalry should be cherished and sustained. The wheat grower, the grazier is protected by ocean and land, by the fact that no foreign article can be introduced to rival his except at a cost for transportation of some thirty to one hundred per cent. on its value; while our Manufactures can be inundated by foreign competition at a cost of some two to ten per cent. It is the grain-grower, the cattle-raiser, who is protected by a duty on Foreign Manufactures, quite as much as the spinner or shoemaker. He who talks of Manufactures being protected and nothing else, might just as sensibly complain that we fortify Boston and New York, and not Pittsburgh and Cincinnati.

Again: You see here our answer to those philosophers who modestly tell us that their views are liberal and enlightened, while ours are benighted, selfish, and un-Christian. They tell us that the foreign factory laborer is anxious to exchange with us the fruits of his labor—that he asks us to give him of our surplus of Grain for the Cloth that he is ready to make cheaper than we can now get it, while we have a superabundance of bread. Now, putting for the present out of the question the fact that though our Tariff were abolished, *his* would remain—that neither England, nor France, nor any great manufacturing Country would receive our Grain untaxed though we offered so to take her Goods—especially the fact that they never *did* so take of us while we were freely taking of them—we say to them, “Sirs, we are willing to take Cloth of you for Grain; but why prefer to trade at a ruinous disadvantage to both? Why should there be half the diameter of the earth between him who makes coats and him who makes bread, the one for the other? We are willing to give you bread for clothes, but we are not willing to pay two-thirds of our bread as the cost of transporting the other third to you, because we sincerely believe it needless, and greatly to our disadvantage. We are willing to work for and buy of you, but not to support the useless and crippling activity of a falsely-directed Commerce; not to contribute by our sweat to the luxury of your nobles, the power of your kings. But come to us, you who are honest, peaceable and industrious; bring here your machinery, or if that is not yours, bring here your snaws; and we will aid you to reproduce the implements of your skill. We will give you more bread for your cloth here than you can possibly earn for it where you are; if you will but come among us and aid us to sustain the policy that secures

steady employment and a fair reward to home Industry. We will no longer aid to prolong your existence in a state of semi-starvation where you are; but we are ready to share with you our Plenty and our Freedom here.” Such is the answer which the friends of Protection make to the demand and the imputation. Judge ye, whether our policy be indeed selfish, un-Christian and insane.

XI. A Simple Illustration.

Take any two Counties or Villages in the land, in one of which the People shall have, and have had for years, a general habit of giving the preference in their purchases to the mechanics and artisans located among them; without merely calculating at every purchase the chances of buying two to ten per cent. cheaper at some distant City, (and probably spending in transportation more than they have saved in price,) while in the other the opposite spirit and practice shall have prevailed, and you will almost certainly find the former community independent, flourishing, and largely increased in population, while the latter will have become stationary in improvement, and probably declining in population and wealth. I speak of the natural effects of these two different systems, and I cannot be mistaken. Of course, other influences may have been at work to modify the results—if the community first cited is intemperate, while the other is sober—if the former is prodigal in any way, while the latter is moral, industrious and frugal—a different aspect would obviously be presented at the end of a life-time. Yet this is barely a supposable, certainly not a probable, case; for that community which cherishes its own Industry and strives to develop and perfect it will hardly be apt to fall behind in respect to moral or economical habits. We shall find, moreover, that the community which steadily pursues the policy of treating its own mechanics and artisans with generous kindness, and not deserting them when a shilling is to be gripped by sending fifty dollars out of the country, will soon acquire a corresponding reputation abroad—will stimulate the efforts of its native workmen to produce a better article and one which can be afforded cheaply, and will soon attract the most skillful and energetic artisans from abroad. In this way it will make itself a local centre of manufacturing operations, an exporter rather than importer of the products of art and ingenuity, and ultimately produce all such articles at home much cheaper than they can be obtained from abroad. This is a very obvious as well as natural result. Inquire in any village, and find that the clergyman, lawyer, doctor, and merchant, are in the habit of going to the nearest city or county seat to have their clothes made, and you will find tailoring a poor business in that village, and poorly done, too. Ask these customers why they go abroad for clothes, and they will tell you it is because they cannot get a garment decently made at home at a reasonable price. They probably forget that their going abroad creates, or at least aggravates, the very deficiency they complain of; that if they all would unite to sustain him they might induce a good tailor to establish himself there, and make clothes as cheap and as well as they are made

elsewhere. But so long as all the best work and best pay goes elsewhere, they must not expect good workmen to stay with them. They must be ready at first to make a little sacrifice, if necessary, to induce artisans of the right stamp to come among and remain with them. It is not that tailors really require a higher price for making a coat in their village than elsewhere; but the man who would starve on the making of twenty coats a year at six dollars each, mostly for persons who patronize him because they must pay in some sort of barter and therefore cannot go abroad, would thrive and be content on the making of one hundred coats a year for five dollars each, including those of cash customers and affording him steady employment.—Is it hard, then, to see how Protection can benefit the home producers of a protected article without increasing the cost to the consumer?

XII. Home and Foreign Production.

But let us assume that this Village or County pays a higher money price for the fabrics of its own artisans than the lowest price at which they could be procured elsewhere. We will suppose that the cost of the Home Production of Manufactures will average ten per cent. more (which it would not) than the lowest prices at which similar Goods could be bought abroad under Free Trade—let us contrast the account. We will first try the case of Free Trade and Foreign Manufactures. We will say that—

<i>We buy abroad (per annum.)</i>	
5,000,000 yds. Broadcloth, at an average cost of \$2 per yd.	\$10,000,000
10,000,000 do. Finnet, at " 30 cts.	2,000,000
10,000,000 lbs. of Hardware, (Screws, &c. &c., at an average cost of 10 cts per lb.)	1,000,000
100,000,000 yds. Cotton Goods, at " 10 cts per yd	10,000,000
4,000,000 Carpets and Carpeting " 50 cts.	2,000,000
Total cost.	\$25,000,000

Now estimate the cost of producing these articles at home at 10 per cent. more, and their price will be.....\$27,500,000

Here, says a Free Trader, is Two Millions and a Half filched from the American People by Protection.

—No, sir, you mistake egregiously. The Home Production of these articles will give steady employment and fair wages to many thousands of Women, Children and others who would find no adequate work or wages under Free Trade, which, by blighting our manufacturing industry, would drive and keep whole classes in general idleness. But this is not all: Among the items of the cost of the home production of the articles above enumerated would be found several like these:

1,000,000 cords of Wood, averaging \$1.50.....	\$1,500,000
1,000,000 tons of Coal, averaging \$3.....	3,000,000
Fruits, Vegetables, &c. consumed by the workmen employed in the various factories, &c. (articles which are of no value to export), at least.....	5,000,000

And so on. Allowing that the home production of the whole amount of Manufactures consumed by the People of the United States cost \$100,000,000, while the same quantity and quality could be imported at a cost of \$80,000,000, it is to my mind as clear as any proposition can be made that the Home Production would be infinitely preferable, that our Country would thrive faster under this than the opposite policy, and that the great mass of our People would be better fed and clad, and every way more com-

fortable, than if we bought these Goods abroad at a price nominally 20 per cent. less. Mind that I do not say or believe that the Home Product would cost more, but that if such were the fact it would be still decidedly preferable. For, suppose that we could buy abroad Goods for Eighty Millions which we now make at home and charge each other One Hundred Millions for; does any man know—can any man imagine—where we are to sell Eighty Millions' worth more of our Products to pay with? We could export some more Cotton, if we imported all our Cotton Goods—and of Wool, if we imported all our Woollens—but not enough in either instance to pay for the import of that special article; not enough in all to pay one-half the cost of our imported Manufactures. And how does any man imagine that the balance would be paid for?—How could it, except by bankruptcy?

XIII. Protective Duties Essential.

I have already stated that the object of Protection is not to make our Country a Manufacturer for other Nations, but for herself—not to make her the baker and brewer and tailor of other people, but of her own household. If I understand at all the first rudiments of National Economy, it is best for each and all Nations that each should mainly fabricate for itself, freely purchasing of others all such staples as its own soil or climate proves ungenial to. We appreciate quite as well as our opponents the impolicy of attempting to grow Coffee in Greenland or Glaciers in Malabar—to extract blood from a turnip or sunbeams from cucumbers. A vast deal of wit has been expended on our stupidity by our scuter adversaries, but it has been quite thrown away, except as it has excited the hollow laughter of the ignorant as well as thoughtless. All this, however sharply pushed, falls wide of our true position. To all the fine words we hear about the impossibility of counteracting the laws of Nature, 'Trade regulating itself,' &c. &c. we bow with due deference, and wait for the sage to resume his arguments. What we do affirm is this, that it is best for every Nation to make at home all those articles of its own consumption that can just as well—that is, with nearly or quite as little labor—be made there as any where else. We say it is not wise, it is not well, to send to France for boots, to Germany for hose, to England for knives and forks, and so on; because the real cost of them would be less—even though the nominal price should be slightly more—if we made them in our own country, and the facility of paying for them would be much greater. We do not object to the occasional importation of choice articles to operate as specimens and incentives to our own artisans to improve the quality and finish of their workmanship—where the Home competition does not avail to bring the process to its perfection, as it often will. In such cases, the rich and luxurious will usually be the buyers of these choice articles, and can afford to pay a good duty. There are gentlemen of extra polish in our Cities and Towns who think no coat good enough for them which is not woven in an English loom—no boot adequately transparent which has not been fashioned by a Parisian maker. I quarrel not with their taste; I only say that, since the Govern-

ment *must* have Revenue and the American artisan *should* have Protection, I am glad it is so fixed that these gentlemen shall contribute handsomely to the former, and gratify their aspirations with the least possible detriment to the latter. It does not invalidate the fact or the efficiency of Protection that foreign competition with American workmanship is not entirely shut out. It is the *general* result which is important, and not the exception. Now he who can seriously contend, as some have seemed to do, that Protective Duties do not aid and extend the domestic production of the articles so protected might as well undertake to argue the sun out of the heavens at mid-day. All experience, all common sense, condemn him. Do we not know that our Manufactures first shot up under the stringent Protection of the Embargo and War?—that they withered and crumbled under the comparative Free Trade of the few succeeding years?—that they were revived and extended by the Tariffs of 1824 and '28? Do we not know that Germany, crippled by British policy which inundated her with goods yet excluded her grain and timber, was driven years since to the establishment of her "Zoll Verein" or Tariff Union—a measure of careful and stringent Protection, under which Manufactures have grown up and flourished through all her many States? She has adhered steadily, firmly to her Protective Policy, while we have faltered and oscillated; and what is the result? She has created and established her Manufactures; and in doing so has vastly increased her wealth and augmented the reward of her industry. Her public sentiment, as expressed through its thousand channels, is almost unanimous in favor of the Protective policy; and now, when England, finding at length that her cupidity has overreached itself—that she cannot supply the Germans with clothes yet refuse to buy their bread—talks of relaxing her Corn-laws in order to coax back her ancient and profitable customer, the answer is "No; it is now too late. We have built up 'Home Manufactures in repelling your rapacity—we cannot destroy them at your caprice. 'What guaranty have we that, should we accede to your terms, you would not return again to 'your policy of taking all and giving none as 'soon as our factories had crumbled into ruin? 'Besides, we have found that we can make 'cheaper—really cheaper—than we were able to 'buy—can pay better wages to our laborers and 'secure a better and steadier market for our products. We are content to abide in the position to which you have driven us. Pass on!"

But this is not the sentiment of Germany alone. All Europe acts on the principle of self-Protection; because all Europe sees its benefits. The British journals complain that, though they have made a show of relaxing their own Tariff, and their Premier has made a Free Trade speech in Parliament, the chaff has caught no birds; but *six hostile Tariffs*—all Protective in their character, and all aimed at the supremacy of British Manufactures, were enacted within the year 1842. And thus, while schoolmen plausibly talk of the adoption and spread of Free Trade principles, and their rapid advances to speedy ascendancy, the practical man knows that the truth is otherwise, and that many years must elapse before the great

Colossus of Manufacturing monopoly will find another Portugal to drain of her life-blood under the delusive pretence of a commercial reciprocity. And while Britain continues to pour forth her specious treatises on Political Economy, proving Protection a mistake and an impossibility, with her Parliamentary Reports and Speeches in praise of Free Trade, the shrewd Statesmen of other nations humor the joke with all possible gravity, and pass it on to the next neighbor, yet all the time take care of their own interests, just as though Adam Smith had never speculated nor Peel soberly expatiated on the blessings of Free Trade, looking round occasionally with a curious interest to see whether any body were really taken in by it.

XIV. Protection beneficial to all classes.

Why can't our manufacturers go alone?" petulantly asks a Free Trader; "they have been protected long enough. They ought not to need it any more." To this I answer that if manufactures were protected as a matter of special bounty or favor to the Manufacturers, a single day were too long. I would not consent that they should be sustained one day longer than the interests of the *whole* country required. I think you have already seen that not for the sake of manufacturers but for the sake of all Productive Labor, should Protection be afforded. If I have been intelligible, you will have seen that the purpose and essence of Protection is LABOR-SAVING—the making two blades of grass grow instead of one. This it does by 'planting the Manufacturer [as nearly as may be] by the side of the Farmer,' as Mr. Jefferson expressed it, and thereby securing to the latter a market for which he had looked to Europe in vain. Now the market of the latter is certain as the recurrence of appetite; but that is not all. The Farmer and the Manufacturer, being virtually neighbors, will interchange their productions directly, or with but one intermediate, instead of sending them reciprocally across half a Continent and a broad ocean, through the hands of many holders until the toll taken out by one after another has exceeded what remains of the gist. 'Dear-bought and far fetched' is an old maxim, containing more *essential* truth than many a chapter by a modern Professor of Political Economy. Under the Protective policy, instead of having one thousand men making cloth on one continent, and an equal number raising grain on the other, with three thousand factitiously employed in transporting and interchanging their products, we have over two thousand producers of Grain and as many of Cloth, leaving far too little employment for one thousand in making the exchanges between them. The consequence is inevitable; although the production in either side is not confined to the very choicest locations, the total product of their labor is twice as much as formerly. In other words, there is a double quantity of food, clothing and all the necessities and comforts of life to be shared among the producers of wealth, simply from the diminution of the number of non-producers. If all the men now enrolled in Armies and Navies were advantageously employed in Productive labor, there would doubtless be a larger dividend of comforts and necessities of life for all, because more to be divided than now and no more to receive it: just so in the case before us. Every thousand persons employed in

needless transportation and in factitious Commerce are so many subtracted from the great body of Producers from the proceeds of whose labor all must be subsisted. The dividend for each must of course be governed by the magnitude of the quotient.

But if this be so advantageous, it is queried, why is any legislation necessary? Why would not all voluntarily see and embrace it? I answer, because the apparent individual advantage is often to be pursued by a course directly adverse to the general welfare. We know that Free Trade asserts the contrary of this, maintaining that if every man pursues that course which seems most conducive to his individual interest, the general good will thereby be most certainly and signally promoted. But to say nothing of the glaring exceptions to this law which crowd our statute-books with injunctions and penalties, we are every where met with pointed contradictions of its assumption, which hallows and blesses the pursuits of the gambler, the distiller and the libertine, making the usurer a saint and the swindler a hero. Adam Smith himself admits that there are vocations which enrich the individual but impoverish the community. So in the case before us. A. B. is a farmer in Illinois, and has much grain to sell or exchange for goods. But, while it is demonstrable that, if *all* the manufactures consumed in Illinois were produced there the price of grain must rise nearly to the average of the world, it is equally certain that A. B.'s *single act*, in buying and consuming American cloth, will not raise the price of grain generally, nor of *his* grain. It will not perceptibly affect the price of grain at all. A solemn compact of the whole community to use only American fabrics would have some effect, but this could never be established or never enforced. A few Free Traders standing out, selling their Grain at any advance which might accrue and buying 'where they could buy cheapest,' would induce one after another to look out for No. 1, and let the public interests take care of themselves, and the whole compact would fall to pieces like a rope of sand. Many a one would say, "Why should I aid to keep up the price of 'Produce? I am only a consumer of it"—not realizing or caring for the interest of the community, even though it less palpably involved his own; and that would be an end. Granted that it is desirable to encourage and pre-er Home Production and Manufacture, a Tariff is the obvious way and the only way in which it can be effectively and certainly accomplished.

XV. *Protection is needed to sustain as well as to establish.*

But why is a Tariff necessary after Manufactures are once established? 'You say,' says a Free Trader, 'that you can manufacture cheaper if Protected than we can buy abroad; then why not do it *without* Protection, and save all trouble?' Let me answer this cavil:

I will suppose that the Manufactures of this Country amount in value to One Hundred Millions of Dollars per annum, and those of Great Britain to Three Hundred Millions. Let us suppose also that under an efficient Protective Tariff ours are produced five per cent. cheaper than those of England, and that our own markets are supplied entirely from the Home Product. But

at the end of this year, 1844, we, concluding that our Manufactures have been protected long enough and ought now to go alone, repeal absolutely our Tariff, and commit our great interests thoroughly to the guidance of 'Free Trade.' Well: at this very time the British Manufacturers, on making up the account and review of their year's business, find that they have manufactured goods costing them Three Hundred Millions, as aforesaid, and have sold to just about that amount, leaving a residue or surplus on hand of Fifteen or Twenty Millions' worth. These are to be sold, and their nett proceeds will constitute the interest on their capital and the profit on their year's business. But *where* shall they be sold? If crowded on the Home or their established Foreign Markets, they will glut and depress those markets, causing a general decline of prices and a heavy loss, not merely on this quantity of goods, but on the whole of their next year's business. They know better than to do any such thing. Instead of it they say, "Here is the American Market just thrown open to us by a repeal of their 'Tariff'; let us send thither our surplus and sell it 'for what it will fetch.'" They ship it over accordingly, and in two or three weeks it is rattling off through our Auction Stores, at prices first five, then ten, fifteen, twenty, and down to thirty per cent. below our previous rates. Every jobber and dealer is tickled with the idea of buying goods of novel patterns so wonderfully cheap, and the sale proceeds briskly, though at constantly declining prices, till the whole stock is disposed of and our market is gorged to repletion.

Now the British Manufacturers may not have received for the whole Twenty Millions' worth of Goods over Fourteen or Fifteen Millions: but what of it? Whatever it may be is clear profit on their year's business in cash or its full equivalent. All their established markets are kept clear and eager; and they can now go on vigorously and profitably with the business of the new year. But more: they have crippled an active and growing rival; they have breached a new market which shall ere long be theirs also. Let us look at our side of the question.

The American Manufacturers have also a stock of Goods on hand, and they come into our market to dispose of them. But they suddenly find that market forestalled and depressed by rival fabrics of attractive novelty, and selling in profusion at prices which rapidly run down to twenty-five per cent. below cost. What are they to do? They cannot force sales at any price not utterly ruinous; there is no demand at any rate. They cannot retaliate upon England the mischief they must suffer—her Tariff forbids; and the other markets of the world are fully supplied and will bear but a limited pressure. The foreign influx has created a scarcity of money as well as a plethora of goods. Specie has largely been exported in payment, which has compelled the banks to contract and deny loans. Still, their obligations must be met; if they cannot make sales the *She-riff* will and must. It is not merely their surplus but their whole product and property which has been depreciated and made unavailable at a blow. The end is easily foreseen: Our Manufacturers become bankrupt and are broken up; their works are brought to a dead stand; the Laborers there-

Now, if the American Tariff is repealed, the British Manufacturers will be ruined, and the American Manufacturers will be ruined.

in, after spending months in constrained idleness, are driven by famine into the western wilderness or into less productive and less congenial avocations; their acquired skill and dexterity, as well as a portion of their time are a dead loss to themselves and the community; and we commence the slow and toilsome process of rebuilding and re-arranging our industry on the one-sided or Agricultural basis. Such is the process which we have undergone twice already. How many repetitions shall satisfy us?

XVI. Profit and Loss.

Now will any man gravely argue that we have made Five or Six Millions by this cheap purchase of British goods—by ‘buying where we could buy cheapest’? Will he not see that though the price was low, the cost is very great? But the apparent saving is doubly deceptive; for the British manufacturers, having utterly crushed their American rivals by one or two operations of this kind, soon find here a market, not for a beggarly surplus of Fifteen or Twenty Millions, but they have now a demand for the amount of our whole consumption, which, making allowance for our diminished ability to pay, would probably still reach Fifty Millions per annum. This increased demand would soon produce activity and buoyancy in the general market; and now the foreign manufacturers would say in their consultations, “We have sold some millions’ worth of goods to America for less than cost, in order to obtain control of that market; now we have it, and must retrieve our losses”—and they would retrieve them with interest. They would have a perfect right to do so. I hope no man has understood me as implying any infringement of the dictates of honesty on their part, still less of the laws of trade. They have a perfect right to sell goods in our markets on such terms as we prescribe and they can afford; it is we, who set up our own vital interests to be bowled down by their rivalry, who are alone to be blamed.

Who does not see that this sending out our great Industrial Interests unarmed and unshielded to battle against the mail clad legions opposed to them in the arena of Trade is to ensure their destruction? It were just as wise to say that, because our people are brave, therefore they shall repel any invader without fire arms, as to say that the restrictions of other nations ought not to be opposed by us because our artisans are skillful and our Manufactures have made great advances.—The very fact that our Manufactures are greatly extended and improved is the strong reason why they should not be exposed to destruction. If they were of no amount or value, their loss would be less disastrous; but now the Five or Six Millions we should make on the cheaper importation of goods would cost us One Hundred Millions in the destruction of manufacturing property alone.

Yet this is but an item of our damage. The Manufacturing classes feel the first effect of the blow, but it would paralyze every muscle of Society. One hundred thousand artisans and laborers, discharged from our ruined factories, after being some time out of employment, at a waste of millions of the National wealth, are at last driven by famine to engage in other avocations—of course with inferior skill and at an inferior price. The farmer, gardener, grocer, lose them

as customers to meet them as rivals. They crowd the labor markets of those branches of industry which we are still permitted to pursue, just at the time when the demand for their products has fallen off and the price is rapidly declining. The result is just what we have seen in a former instance: all that any man may make by buying Foreign goods, he loses ten times over by the decline of his own property, product or labor; while to nine-tenths of the whole people the result is unmixed calamity. The disastrous consequences to a nation of the mere derangement and paralysis of its Industry which must follow the breaking down of any of its great Producing Interests have never yet been sufficiently estimated. Free Trade, indeed, assures us that every person thrown out of employment in one place our capacity has only to choose another; but almost every working man knows from experience that such is not the fact—that the loss of a situation through the failure of his business is oftener a sore calamity. I know a worthy citizen who spent six years in learning the trade of a hatter, which he had just perfected in 1798, when an immense importation of Foreign Hats utterly paralyzed the manufacture in this country. He traveled and sought for months, but could find no employment at any price, and at last gave up the pursuit, found work in some other capacity, and never made a hat since. He lives yet, and now comfortably, for he is industrious and frugal; but the six years he gave to learn his trade were utterly lost to him—lost for the want of adequate and steady Protection to Home Industry. I insist that the Government has failed to discharge its proper and rightful duty to that citizen, and to thousands and tens of thousands who have suffered from like causes. I insist that if the Government had permitted without complaint a foreign force to land on our shores and plunder that man’s house of the savings of six years of faithful industry, the neglect of duty would not have been more flagrant. And I firmly believe that the People of this country are One Thousand Millions of Dollars poorer at this moment than they would have been had their entire Productive Industry been steadily protected, on the principles I have laid down, from the formation of the Government till now. The steadiness of employment and of recompense thus secured, the comparative absence of constrained idleness, and the more efficient application of the labor actually performed, would have vastly increased the product—would have improved and beautified the whole face of the country; and the Moral and Intellectual advantages thence accruing would alone have been inestimable. A season of suspension of labor in a community is one of aggravated dissipation, drunkenness and crime.

XVII. Foreign Competition and Prices.

But let me more clearly illustrate the effect of foreign competition in raising prices to the consumer. To do this, I will take my own calling for an example, because I understand that best; though any of you can apply the principle to that with which he may be better acquainted. I am a publisher of newspapers, and suppose I afford them at a cheap rate. But the ability to maintain that cheapness is based on the fact that I can certainly sell a large edition daily, so that no part of that edition shall remain a dead loss on my

hands. But if there were an active and formidable Foreign competition in newspapers; if the edition which I printed during the night were frequently rendered unsalable by the arrival of a foreign ship freighted with newspapers early in the morning, the present rates could not be continued: the price must be increased or the quality would decline. I presume this holds equally good of the production of calicoes, glass, and penknives, as of newspapers, though it may be somewhat modified by the nature of the article to which it is applied. That it does hold true of sheetings, nails, and thousands of articles, is abundantly notorious. I have not burthened you with statistics—you know they are the reliance, the stronghold of the cause of Protection, and that we can produce them by acres. My aim has been not to exhibit not mere collections of facts, however pertinent and forcible, but the *laws* on which those facts are based—not the immediate manifestation but the ever-living necessity from which it springs. The contemplation of these laws assures me that those articles which are supplied to us by Home Production alone, are relatively cheaper than those which are rivaled and competed with from abroad. And I am equally confident that the shutting out of Foreign competition from our markets for other articles of general necessity and literal consumption which can be made here with as little labor as any where, would be followed by a corresponding result—a reduction of the price to the consumer at the same time with increased employment and reward to our Producing Classes.

But, were this only on one side true—were it certain that the price of the Home product would be permanently higher than that of the Foreign, I should still insist on efficient Protection, and for reasons I have sufficiently shown. Grant that a British cloth costs but \$3 per yard, and a corresponding American fabric \$4, I still hold that the latter would be decidedly the cheaper. The fuel, timber, fruits, vegetables, &c. &c., which make up so large a share of the cost of the Home product, would be rendered comparatively valueless by having our workshops in Europe. I look not so much to the nominal price as to the comparative facility of payment. And where cheapness is only to be attained by a depression of the wages of Labor to the neighborhood of the European standard, I prefer that it should be dispensed with. One thing must answer to another; and I hold that the farmers of this country can better afford, as a matter of pecuniary advantage, to pay a good price for manufactured articles than to obtain them lower through the depression and inadequacy of the wages of the artisan and laborer.

XVIII. *How Protection increases the price of Agricultural Products, and at the same time reduces that of Manufactures.*

This is a great puzzle to Free Traders, and to many who have only superficially examined the subject. 'You argue,' say they, 'that Protective Duties will enable us to obtain our supplies of Cloths, Wares, &c. cheaper, ultimately if not immediately, than if their Home Production were not protected. But you say that *Wool* is made higher by the Tariff, and that the Farmer's Pro-

duce brings a better price generally under Protection than under Free Trade. How are these assumptions to be reconciled?'—Fairly put, gentlemen, and you shall be fully answered. If you will but turn back to our illustration by the exchange of products between the Manufacturers of England and the Farmers of Illinois, and the effect of bringing the two classes of producers side by side on the Western streams and prairies, you will find your difficulty in good part solved. Other things being equal, every article is cheapened to the consumer in proportion as it is produced under circumstances equally advantageous *nearer and nearer the point of consumption*. But there is another and more precisely applicable statement of the truth, to which I now invite your attention.

The careful observer of the laws which govern Production and Distribution will perceive, at the outset, that the fruits of Industry are naturally divisible into two classes in reference to this subject; the first class, embracing mainly Agricultural staples, consisting of such articles as *can only be produced in greater quantity at a proportionate increase of cost*; the second class of articles which *are not subject to this law*. For instance, Farmer A. produces five hundred bushels of Grain per annum and receives three hundred dollars therefor, and he could not afford to produce a double quantity of Grain for less than six hundred dollars. But his neighbor, who prints a village newspaper, has a demand for five hundred copies per week, and receives say seven hundred dollars therefor, and he could print a thousand copies instead of five hundred for much less than double the present cost or remuneration. Is not this plain to every man who knows how newspapers are made?

The distinction here indicated needs but to be traced out to its legitimate results to dispel the perplexity of our querist. In the production of Grain, Wool, &c. the process is simple, and the result so much product per annum from the use of so much Capital and the application of so much Labor. If twice as great a product is required, you must double the Capital and Labor; consequently, any extension of the demand tends primarily to increase the price of the product. But a larger demand for Newspapers or Calicoes creates an ability, other things being equal, to produce at a lower price. I am now printing Newspapers cheaper than I could possibly afford to do if the demand for them were much smaller, or if I were compelled to face in our market a formidable competition from the capricious importation of as many Newspapers as the British and other foreign publishers, having failed to sell them at home, chose to send out here. So in the articles of Calicoes and Fancy Prints of all kinds; it is easily seen that they can be made cheaper in this country as the market for them is extended and steadied by the exclusion of Foreign competition. Give the American printers a ready, constant market for all the Newspapers they could print by the aid of steam and cylinder presses, and they could and would print far cheaper than they now do—for one-third the average cost of Newspapers in this country, or one-sixth their average cost the world over. Just so with the makers of cloths or anything else subject to the

same law of production. At this moment plain cotton fabrics and flannels are notoriously sold cheaper than any other descriptions of goods; their production, by the improvements in machinery and in trade, having been reduced nearly to the same law which governs the productions of Wool and Grain, except that the power of production is practically infinite, and an increased demand for Cloth does not essentially raise the cost of the elements of its production, except Cotton and Wool. A manufacturer of these fabrics needs to take no account of chances that the goods will not sell, or will become unfashionable, or (now) be supplanted by Foreign fabrics. He has only to count the cost of his Cotton and his Labor, with a proper allowance for the use of Capital, the wear of Machinery, and the probability that it will be superseded by something better in the rapid march of Improvement. The fact, therefore, is well known that, compared with the absolute, inevitable cost, plain cottons and flannels are much cheaper than fine broad cloths and fancy goods.

Does any one fail to see how the present Tariff has increased the price of Wool by widening and quickening the market for it, while shutting out the supply which would else reach us from countries where it is produced cheaper than with us?—while at the same time it has reduced, and will further reduce, the cost of many descriptions of goods? It may not have reduced the cost of plain cottons and flannels, for the plain reason already indicated that they were already nearly as cheap as possible, nor has it increased them, the cost of the raw material being regarded. But on De Laines and nearly all descriptions of Fancy Goods, its effect is inevitably to reduce prices, by rendering the market for our producers palpably broader, stadier and surer than it could be in the absence of a Tariff or under a low one.

It is most true, therefore, that some articles have been made cheaper, others dearer, by the present Tariff. That our Farmers will this year realize an average of 25 per cent. more for their various productions than they would do under a horizontal 20 per cent. Tariff, I am confident—not that Agricultural Staples will be much higher in the great Commercial Cities, (perhaps not 5 per cent.) but because this Tariff gives vitality and vigor to Mechanical and Manufacturing operations all over the Country, and these afford the great majority of our Farmers a market for their products in their own sections respectively, obviating the necessity of producing mainly Grain and other staples, and encouraging them to produce the more profitable Fruits, Vegetables, &c. which will not bear transportation to a distant market. This is the way the Farmer is benefited by Protection—not by shutting out Foreign Grain, Meat, Vegetables, &c. on which the bare cost of Importation is equivalent to an average protection of fifty per cent. (Wool, being of little weight in proportion to its value, forms an exception to the general rule, as Cotton would measurably do, if it could be produced almost every where, as Wool may.) But the Farmer of the interior is protected by whatever tends to bring a market for his surplus near and nearer his door, and the Farmer of the seaboard and the vicinity of the great Cities is protected by whatever checks the

tendency of the produce of the interior to crowd to the seaboard by finding it a market nearer home.

XIX. The Laborer's Interest.

Can any man seriously doubt, in view of the considerations already adduced, that the policy of Protection is emphatically the shield and support of the Laboring class, and that its overthrow would subject the Laborers of our country to a depressing and ruinous competition with the beggared Labor of Europe, Asia, or wherever Labor is ground down to the lowest apology for subsistence? I have indulged in no declamation—I will use none—I ask only that facts may be considered. I am quite aware that ill-paid, untaught, half-famished Labor is far less efficient than that of energetic, intelligent Freemen, and that the price of a day's work may be considerably less in other countries than here, and yet production be as cheap here as there. But to this there is obviously a limit; and if the tailor, the boot-maker, the weaver of Britain and Germany is paid but twenty-five cents a day, it will be idle to expect our employers to maintain an unchecked rivalry with their foreign competitors and pay their workmen a dollar a day. Now the palpable, undeniable result of Free Trade is unlimited competition, and the subjection of our artisans to a direct, determined rivalry with those of whatever Country has ground down its Labor to the lowest condition. This competition does not *immediately* touch the Agriculturist, because Land, an important element of the cost of his staples, will naturally be much dearer in an old and thickly-settled country than in this, and the bulk and perishable nature of most Agricultural products will weigh against their importation by increasing its cost and risk. But every article of small bulk in proportion to its cost and easy of transportation without injury, will inevitably, under Free Trade, tend from the country of cheapest labor to those in which industry is more generously rewarded. The manufacturer would be impelled to say, 'Why should I carry on my business where a man's labor costs me a dollar a day, when I might as well prosecute it where a day's work costs but a third as much, and bring my goods here at a trifling expense? I cannot afford it—I must remove or be ruined!' It is evident that, in the absence of Protective duties, Manufactures would concentrate in old countries, where Labor is cheap and Interest low, leaving such lands as ours with few or none, except of the rudest and simplest kind. We must in the main be Farmers or Planters and their hired assistants—nothing else.

Now the disadvantages of this change, as I have endeavored to show, would fall not upon a few classes, but ultimately upon the great mass of the People, especially all who live by Labor. The cost and risk of bringing all our fabrics from Europe and sending Agricultural staples thither to pay for them, would add many millions per annum to the number of days' labor now required to be done to supply the wants of our people. The actual recompense of labor must be diminished (no matter what the nominal wages may be) in proportion as the actual cost of supplying the aggregate wants of our people is enlarged.

To produce ten thousand yards of Broadcloth in England and ten thousand barrels of Flour in Illinois will require (as we have seen) substantially the same amount of labor as if both were produced in our Country, while the expense of transporting, interchanging and distributing them to the consumers will be greatly enhanced. Every dollar so added to the cost will be subtracted from the earnings and the comforts of the Laboring Millions.

But all these considerations are beyond or beneath the consideration of Free Trade. It asks only, 'How shall my desires be satisfied at the smallest expense?'—that is, for the fewest dollars—all beyond that is immaterial. It does not see, or does not care, that unlimited competition arrays laborer against laborer in a strife to see which can subsist on the smallest modicum of wages, and that ultimately the *lowest* wages within the vast circle of competition would become the measure of recompense for the whole. If good boots are made at two dollars a pair in one country, three in another, and four in a third, the tendency of a 'Free Trade' between them is not to raise the average price of boot-making in these countries to four dollars, nor yet to fix it at three, but to reduce it to two. Let the Laborers of America beware, then, of those superficial partisans who tell them that, because European Governments restrict importations and yet their labor is ill paid, therefore Protection is the cause of their miseries! No man has ever supposed that Protection is the *only* element of National well-being, and that its maintenance would neutralize all the evils of an extravagant Court, an enormous Standing Army, a vast war-created National Debt, a pampered Aristocracy, a lordly Church Establishment, and all the multiplied evils which centuries of ignorance and misrule have imposed on most of the Nations of Europe. There are evils which a Protected Industry may aid a people to bear, but which it is not alone competent to remove. And if our People would subject themselves to bear a portion of these barthens of other Nations they have only to acquiesce in that sort of 'Free Trade' which taxes Foreign Products from nothing to twenty per cent. in our ports and allows them to tax our staples an average of over one hundred in theirs. Under this policy, the taxes levied on England and France are in good part paid by our own hardy tillers of the soil.

XX. Labor and Capital.

I have thus endeavored to present the Protective Policy in its true light, briefly of course as the size of this publication compelled, but clearly, fairly, and in direct comparison with the doctrines of Free Trade. I am not aware of having left untouched any material point in controversy between Protectionists and their opponents, though many are touched briefly and others only hinted at. I have endeavored to present and elucidate the leading principles involved in the main question, by applying which every special cavil is to be met and refuted.

Yet I am quite aware that a chief ground of hostility to Protection on the part of many Laboring Men remains untouched—namely, the alleged inadequacy of Wages in Manufactories, the excessive hours of toil there required, the con-

trolling power of Capital in this department of the National Industry, &c. &c. I am not surprised that such considerations should be employed by dexterous politicians to excite unreflecting popular hostility against Protection, yet it is not the less obvious to my mind that they have properly nothing to do with the subject. For, allowing it to be the fact that too much Labor is exacted from and too little wages paid to the employed in factories, I ask what remedy the adversaries of Protection propose? If we give heed to them, and break down our Manufactures, how will the condition of the Laboring Class be improved? Grant that twelve or thirteen hours' work per day is too much, and the compensation paid therefore often too little, how will the laborer be benefited by depriving him of the privilege of so exchanging his work for wages? Do you say that on the destruction of the factories he will find employment more advantageous and less arduous? I answer that he has every opportunity *now* to choose another employment, and I am sure I have shown this *now* are more chances for him and better wages *now* in the factories than there would be if they were destroyed. No man is compelled to work in a cotton-mill or iron-foundry who can do better at any thing else; no man *loses* so work except from a preference of the employment and the wages over any other that are at his option. Why, then, should any oppose Protection on this ground? Is it not notorious that the average wages of Manufacturing labor is higher than that of the labor employed in Agriculture?

I am no advocate for any form of abuse or oppression; if any such exist in connexion with Manufacturing Labor, I trust a remedy will be devised and enforced—I will do, as I have heretofore done, all within my humble ability to promote such a consummation. I have long believed and urged that the hours of labor in many Manufacturing establishments are excessive and should be reduced. But how shall this be accomplished? Congress can obviously do nothing—it has no power in the premises. If the States can effect any good by legislation, let them do it; but this is all apart from the Tariff question. And surely no man of common intelligence can fail to see that iron Necessity rules the Employer as well as the Laborer—that no company or individual mill-owner can afford to run their or his works but ten hours while his rivals in the business run twelve or thirteen, nor can he pay many per cent. higher wages than they do. Should any one attempt such a course, he would soon be arrested by ruin. Unchecked competition ensues and rigorously enforces its laws, and no man need hope to escape them—no man should be blamed for yielding to them. But here a wide field opens before us, which cannot be traversed in this essay.

But, while I admit and insist that any oppression which may exist in connexion with Manufacturing labor should be exposed and corrected, I am convinced that much of the clamor against Manufacturing companies on this ground is unfounded and unjust—some of it hollow and hypocritical. I know that many who declaim against the hardship of women working in factories twelve or thirteen hours a day for some dollar and a half (beside board) per week, do not scruple themselves to employ women in their own houses at

less wages, and keep them at work quite as many hours. I know that the average earnings of seamstresses in our city, and in most cities, are less than those of factory girls at Lowell, and their labor more protracted and arduous. But this is no excuse for oppression any where. We all know that the general if not universal rule is to buy cheap, hire cheap, and regard Necessity rather than abstract Justice in business transactions, and I do not suppose that Manufacturing employers are better in this respect than other men. They probably pay, as a general rule, nothing more than the market price of Labor. The correction of the evil here indicated belongs rather to the department of Social than of Political Economy.

But while it is not, and never was, pretended by the advocates of Protection that a proper Tariff will remedy all Social or even Political evils—that it will give all men acceptable employment and satisfactory wages—that it will annihilate all oppression, extortion and wrong—it is asserted, and is true, that the Labor of the country is more generally employed and, as a whole, better paid under a Protective Tariff than it would be with Free Trade, and that this has been the case under former Tariffs. Of course, the nominal wages of Labor is seriously affected by other influences than that of the Tariff—by the state of the Currency, Peace or War, good or bad Harvests, &c., &c. But that Protection tends to raise the price of Labor, let the low and declining wages of 1842 and the advances of the last six months bear witness. Compare the average prices of labor now with those paid in years of quiet before we protected our Industry, and this truth will be still more evident. I remember very well that in 1818-19, young women were glad to engage in household work in the country sections of New England at fifty to seventy-five cents per week, while in the same towns (manufactories having since sprung up in the vicinity) they now realize a dollar and a half a week for the same work, and few will do it at that, (though housework is less arduous and more respected now than formerly) preferring to work in the factories. And not only has this gratifying increase of wages been accompanied by no corresponding increase in the cost of the articles they must buy, but nearly all descriptions of the fabrics they wear—especially all that are now made in our own country—are sold for *one-half to one third* the prices they formerly bore. In other words, a woman's wages for a week, which would hardly bring three yards of decent calico in 1810, (wages 75 cents per week, calicoes 25 cents per yard,) will now buy *twelve* yards of an equally good fabric, or four times the quantity. Is here no improvement?

The assertions of extraordinary profit derived from Manufacturing operations are in many instances false, in nearly all deceptive. If a company divides ten per cent. it is blazoned in all the papers hostile to Protection, while twenty companies which divide little or nothing pass unheralded, and even the same companies have often made no dividend for years without attracting any notice. But it cannot be necessary to pursue this subject, since all are aware that the business of Manufacturing, like all other business, is open to all, and Capital can always command the requisite skill and labor at fair prices. At this moment

there are scores of factories and furnaces standing idle, (as they, and many more, have stood for years,) which may readily be purchased at half their cost, or may be rented at very low rates. If those who clamor about the excessive profits of Manufacturing really believed what they assert, many of them would be quietly engaged in the business before a month. Nothing hinders but their own conviction that what they assert is not essentially true.

XXI. Conclusion.

It must gratify every lover of fair dealing in Politics—of Progress in solving the great Economical problems which must from time to time present themselves for popular adjustment—of decision and stability in our National Policy and Legislation—to perceive that the question of Protection or No Protection has been, by the recent Conventions at Baltimore, submitted in a broad, clear, palpable form for final adjustment by the verdict of the American People. The rival candidates for President are HENRY CLAY, every where known as an eminent and powerful champion from his youth of the policy of Protection, and JAMES K. POLK, the open, consistent, recorded opponent of that policy. Mr. Clay advocated the Protective policy in the Legislature of Kentucky, nearly forty years ago, and on entering upon a wider sphere of action in Congress, speedily placed himself in the front rank of the advocates of this policy. He is not and never was the advocate of a *prohibitory or exorbitant* Tariff; he has uniformly counseled moderation and conciliation as essential to the stability and success of the Protective policy; he originated the Compromise Act of 1833, by which the Tariff was gradually reduced through the ten succeeding years to one of a purely Revenue character; but he did this to prevent the shedding of rivers of fraternal blood in a contest between the Federal Government and South Carolina—a contest perfectly wanton, as the party then in power was known to be anti-Protective, and determined to cut down the Tariff after conquering or exterminating the Nullifiers. By his wise course at that time, Mr. Clay saved the Manufacturing Industry of the country from immediate destruction, and postponed the whole question to a calmer and more auspicious period, when the delusions of the hour should be dispelled. But Mr. Clay never surrendered the principle of Protection—never intended nor agreed to give it up—as any one who will consult the debates on the Compromise will perceive. That Act did, indeed, contemplate uniform duties of only twenty per cent. after ten years; but this was twenty per cent. on the *Home* Value instead of the *Foreign*—fully equal to thirty per cent. as now levied, and even more on Iron and all bulky articles. And it was well understood at the time that this adjustment would not and could not bind future Congresses—and especially that if this Act proved inadequate for Revenue, (as was the fact,) higher duties must be imposed. Such duties have been imposed by the Tariff of 1842, which Mr. Clay has publicly and repeatedly approved as “wise and proper.” I need not multiply citations—the following from his last letter touching the subject is sufficient. He was pressed to visit Harrisburg, Pa. on his recent return

from Washington to Kentucky, and in his reply observes:

" * * * "WASHINGTON, *Mar. 11, 1844.*
 "I congratulate you on the bright and cheering prospects of the establishment of that *High Policy* so essential, I believe, not only to the prosperity of Pennsylvania, but to that of the whole Union. I happened to be in the House of Representatives when an important part of that policy signally triumphed. The Tariff of 1842 has been bitterly denounced, and gross epithets applied to it. Its repeal was pronounced to be a favorite object of our political opponents. They have a majority of some fifty or sixty in the House. A bill to repeal that Tariff has been pending a great part of the present session of Congress. And yet, yesterday, on a test vote, a majority of the House decided against the repealing bill, leaving the Tariff of 1842 in FULL and SALUTARY OPERATION! This decision was an involuntary concession of our political opponents to the wisdom and beneficence of *High policy*, produced by the returning prosperity of the country and the enlightened opinion of the people.

But, gentlemen, I have a much higher gratification been any which could be derived from that decision of the House of Representatives. It is that the People of the United States, from the St. Johns to the Sabine, who have been so long divided and agitated on the question of the encouragement of Domestic Industry, are about to settle down in union and harmony, upon the equitable basis of raising, in time of peace, the amount of revenue requisite to an economical administration of the Government *exclusively* from foreign imports by a Tariff so adjusted as that by proper discriminations, just and reasonable encouragement *shall be extended to American Industry.* May this happy union and harmony pervade all other great measures of public policy, and nothing occur to disturb the peace, to sully the character, or check the onward and glorious march of our country.

I am your friend and obedient servant, H. CLAY.

Messrs. Samuel H. Clark, A. J. Jones, &c. &c.

—How can any man longer pretend to believe that Mr. Clay is hostile or indifferent to Protection?

—Opposed to Mr. Clay as a candidate for President stands JAMES K. POLK, concerning whose sentiments on this subject his speeches and acts leave no room for dispute. He has been a consistent, determined adversary of Protection through his whole public life. He steadily opposed it while in Congress, and has as steadily opposed it ever since. Throughout last summer he was a candidate for Governor of Tennessee, (and defeated as he had been two years before,) and he canvassed the State thoroughly, every where inveighing against the Tariff of 1842 and any Tariff for Protection. I have not room to make all the citations I could wish; but the following passages from his Speech at Madison, Jackson County, prepared for the press by himself, are sufficient: He said—

"He was opposed to direct taxes, and to prohibitory and protective duties, and in favor of such moderate duties as would not cut off importations. In other words, he was in favor of reducing the duties to the rates of the Compromise Act, where the *Whig Congress found them on the 30th of June, 1842.*"

"The South, and he with them, had voted for the act of 1832 because it was a reduction of the rates of the act of 1828, though by no means so low as he would have desired it to be; still it was a great reduction which could be attained at the time of its passage."

"The difference between the course of the political party with which he (Mr. Milton Brown) acts and myself is, whilst they are the advocates of Distribution and a PROTECTIVE TARIFF—measures which I consider ruinous to the interests of the country, and especially to the interest of the Planting States—I have steadily and at all times opposed both."

Mr. Polk, in the blindness of his hostility to Protection and the present Tariff, revives the long exploded fallacy that a Tariff high enough to be Protective must necessarily be insufficiently productive of Revenue, and asserts that

"It was clear, therefore, that the late Tariff act was not a revenue measure. It had raised the rates of duty so high as to shut out imports, and consequently to cut off and diminish revenue."

This assertion, though it has been a thousand times reiterated by Free Traders, is directly the reverse of the truth. In 1822-24 it was incessantly clamored that a Protective Tariff would destroy Revenue from Customs and compel a

resort to Direct Taxation for the support of the Government. Then such an assertion might be made innocently, because ignorantly, but how can it be now, in the face of the abundant Revenue from Customs derived from the Tariffs of 1824 and 1828, as compared with the inadequate Receipts from the low duties levied in 1838 to '42 in the later stages of the Compromise Act?

But more: the Revenue which ran down to Fourteen Millions under the low duties of 1841 and '42 is already swelled to abundance under the benign operation of the Protective Tariff of 1842, which took effect in September of that year. The receipts from Customs at the port of New York alone for the first six months of 1844, were near ELEVEN MILLIONS AND A HALF OF DOLLARS, or more than the whole receipts at this port in 1841 or 1842, when the Tariff was lowest. I have the precise returns for the first six months, which compare with those of 1843 as follows:

Receipts of Customs at the Port of New-York:

	In 1844.	In 1843.
January.....	\$1,866,614.....	\$649,066.....
February.....	2,169,110.....	492,215.....
March.....	1,688,627.....	867,146.....
April.....	1,810,627.....	1,033,293.....
May.....	1,984,074.....	1,500,841.....
June.....	1,918,044.....	604,748.....

Total.....\$11,321,336.....\$4,466,298
 Increase in 1844.....\$6,775,327!

The receipts at other ports have increased fully in proportion to those at New-York, as returns from Boston, Philadelphia and New-Orleans abundantly show. Should no unforeseen disaster prevent, the total Revenue of 1844 will hardly fall below FORTY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, and may very probably exceed that amount, being more than double the receipts of any Low Tariff year. This will enable the Government to pay off its Public Debt in 1845, distribute the Proceeds of the Public Lands equitably and permanently to all the States, and provide liberally for the speedy improvement of our Harbors and important Rivers.

See also the following from his speech in Congress in 1833, on a bill reported from his Committee for the reduction of the then existing Tariff:

"It appears from this testimony that the duties upon woolsens (now fifty per cent.) may not only be reduced, but that twenty-five per cent. will be a sufficient protection, provided there be a corresponding reduction on the raw material, and the duty be fully and fairly collected; and that the manufacturers of cottons, and especially of coarse cottons, would be able to continue their business profitably at the reduced duty of twelve and a half per cent. on the rival foreign articles."

"The wool-growers consider the duty upon foreign wools as important to their prosperity. This opinion, I apprehend, is founded in error. Very little wool of the maddling quality, such as we produce, is imported. The kinds chiefly imported are either the coarse South American wool, costing eight cents and under the pound, or the fine Saxony wool, costing more than a dollar the pound, neither of which do we produce, or if we do, to a very limited extent."

"My own opinion is that wool should be duty free; but as wool-growers think otherwise, we have retained a duty of fifteen per cent. upon the imported article."—(Congressional Debates, vol. 8, p. 1,174.)

Such are the respective positions and views of the rival candidates for next President of the Union. Whichever is elected will doubtless carry with him in his triumph a Congress prepared to second and give effect to his opinions. Freemen of America! Friends of National Industry and Prosperity! choose ye between them!

☞ The DAILY TRIBUNE \$5 per year, WEEKLY TRIBUNE (hated) at \$2 per year or \$15 for ten copies—CLAY TRIBUNE at 50 cts. for six months (May to November)—also the "JUNIOR TRACTS," and all other Whig documents at the lowest prices, are published by GREELEY & McELRATH, 166 Nassau st. New York.